DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 034 EC 232 649

AUTHOR Allington, Richard L.
TITLE Curriculum and At-Risk Learners: Coherence or Fragmentation?
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania Resources and Information Center for Special Education (PRISE), King of Prussia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Bureau of Special Education.
PUB DATE Mar 90
NOTE 8p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT PRISE Reporter; v21 n3 p1-3 Mar 1990

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum; Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; *High Risk Students; Integrated Activities; Language Arts; Literacy Education; *Reading Difficulties; *Reading Instruction; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; *Remedial Instruction; Special Education

ABSTRACT

At-risk children's acquisition of reading skills can be accelerated if they are provided with more and better instruction than is given their peers who seem to acquire reading rather easily. One aspect of better instruction is a coherent curriculum plan that provides learners with sets of activities that link together and foster learning. Children who participate in remedial and special education programs often are confronted with a fragmented reading curriculum, though they are the very learners who most benefit from a coherent curriculum plan. Remedial and special education programs should build upon, extend, reinforce, and balance the classroom lessons. Coherent curriculum plans identify the reading/language arts curriculum from which all children will work, create opportunities for the development of "shared knowledge" among all professional staff, and foster a collaborative planning and teaching environment. A strategy is offered that leads to development of coherent curriculum plans, to be applied by either the classroom teacher or a specialist teacher. A sample format for 1 week of lessons coordinated between classroom and remedial instruction is appended to the article. This issue also includes brief reviews of resources grouped into the following categories: Current Citations; Research Briefs; Assessment; Resources; Instructional Material; and Software. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED326034

Curriculum and At-Risk Learners: Coherence or Fragmentation?

Richard L. Allington, Ph.D

PRISE Reporter
vol. 21, no. 3, March 1990

Pennsylvania Resources and Information Center for Special Education
200 Anderson Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____

_____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 232649

PAIS reporter
issues in the education of students with handicaps
vol. 21, no. 3, March 1990
pennsylvania resources and information center for special education 200 Anderson Road, King of Prussia, Pa 19406. 215/265-7321

CURRICULUM AND AT-RISK LEARNERS: COHERENCE OR FRAGMENTATION?

Richard L. Allington, Ph.D
State University of New York at Albany

Michael was not finding learning to read easy. He was measurably behind his classmates in his mastery of the classroom meaning-emphasis basal reader and seemed to be steadily losing ground. In an attempt to help Michael, his school sent him down the hall each day for help with reading. Once there, Michael was presented with a second reading program, a code-emphasis series. Now Michael had two sets of words to learn each day, two sets of decoding skills, two sets of worksheets, two sets of comprehension strategies, and two sets of stories of different genres and on different topics. Because Michael was scheduled down the hall during part of his classroom reading period, he now had less time and twice the curriculum load of his classmates who were not having difficulty. Because Michael had two reading programs built from different assumptions about how children learn to read, he was confronted with conflicting sets of skills and strategies. Because Michael was immersed in curriculum fragmentation, his confusion about the reading process increased and he floundered. Unfortunately, the source of Michael's confusion was identified as Michael himself (though some suggested it was more the result of his home environment). No one questioned whether Michael was receiving sufficient instruction. No one seemed to notice the fragmented curriculum plan. No one asked if the school's response could be the source of Michael's difficulties.

In order to optimize learning, some children need access to larger amounts of higher quality instruction than others. There is good evidence that the reading acquisition of many types of at-risk children can be accelerated if they are provided with more and better instruction than is given their peers who seem to acquire reading rather easily. One aspect of better instruction is a coherent curriculum plan.

Curriculum can be understood as an array of interrelated instructional activities that facilitate the acquisition of complex skills, strategies, and knowledge. A coherent curriculum plan provides learners with sets of activities that link together in any number of ways and foster learning. For reading/language arts curriculum, this would entail developing a plan in which, for instance, word study activities across a week would be interrelated. In other words, decoding lessons would link to spelling words, spelling words would be linked to composing activities, composing would link to reading activities (via topic or genre), and the reading activities would offer much opportunity to apply the decoding strategies learned, and so on. Likewise, comprehension strategies would link to composing activities (via text structure or topic), which would link to the application of these strategies in text reading, and so on.

In contrast, one might create a fragmented curriculum plan for reading/language arts. In this case learners would be exposed to an array of activities that did not link to each other: for instance, decoding activities not related to spelling activities, vocabulary study offering no link to decoding or spelling activities, spelling words not used in composing tasks, or comprehension skills sheets not linked to writing and not applied during text reading. One could foster even more fragmentation by offering multiple sets of decoding activities across a week that were unrelated to each other and not linked to real reading or writing tasks. In cases where either sort of fragmentation occurs, learning to be literate becomes more difficult.

The design of remedial and special education

Over the past ten years we have studied the curriculum that at-risk children confront. Unfortunately, children who participate in remedial and special education programs, who would seem to benefit most from a coherent curriculum plan, more often are confronted with a fragmented reading curriculum than those who remain in the regular classroom. We have argued that children who find learning to read difficult are the very learners who most benefit from a coherent curriculum plan and who can least tolerate fragmentation. While many classroom reading/language arts curricula fail our coherence analysis, it is participation in remedial and special education programs that exacerbates fragmentation of the sort that confronted and stymied Michael.

There seem to be several factors involved in the creation of fragmented curriculum plans. A school district influence can be observed in several forms. In some districts the use of alternative curriculum in remedial or special education is mandated. In other words, the district has what we have termed "planned fragmentation" between the regular education program and the various instructional support programs (e.g., Chapter 1, resource room for the mildly handicapped, migrant education, etc.). In these districts we typically find little "shared knowledge" between the professional staffs of regular, remedial, and special education programs. The directors of these programs rarely have much knowledge of the curriculum plans of other programs. In these

This issue focuses on curricular coordination between general and special education programs and on coordination among curricula. It includes information on prevailing practices in reading instruction, curriculum bias in testing, and recommendations for selection and adaptations of basal readers.

EC 232649

districts professional staffs rarely plan or work collaboratively; the left hand rarely knows what the right is doing.

When the left hand is unaware of what the right is doing, there is little reason to suspect that both hands are working together in any coordinated sense. In such situations curriculum fragmentation is the order of the day for at-risk children. When specialist teachers are not aware of the classroom lessons and tasks, they simply cannot provide coherent instruction that meets the standards of quality necessary to optimize learning. When classroom teachers have no idea of what children in their rooms are doing down the hall each day, they cannot provide instruction that meets the quality standards necessary.

The redesign of remedial and special education

Ideally, remedial and special education programs would build upon, extend, reinforce, and balance the classroom lessons. Such coherent instruction fosters accelerated progress in the classroom curriculum-- accelerating learning so that the child narrows the gap between himself and his classmates. However, most school districts perpetuate curriculum fragmentation, through their "planned fragmentation" or by neglecting to develop a curriculum plan linking the instruction offered in different programs. Ideally, school districts would create coherent curriculum plans for all children, but with special attention to the coherence of the curricular experiences of at-risk children and careful consideration of children served by both classroom and specialist teachers. Such plans identify the reading/language arts curriculum from which all children will work, create opportunities for the development of "shared knowledge" among all professional staff, and foster a collaborative planning and teaching environment. For instance, the IEP for a mainstreamed child would be collaboratively developed by the classroom and specialist teachers who serve the child. The IEP would be focused on accelerating progress through the core curriculum with anticipated roles for each teacher noted.

In the absence of an ideal district plan there are several things classroom and specialist teachers can do. As a first step the specialist teacher can simply become more aware of the current classroom instructional program and materials. In the case of reading/language arts instruction, often a basal reading series and a spelling book define many of the curriculum tasks the child confronts in the classroom. In such cases, an initial step is simply to review those materials and the child's current placement. The objective is not to simply replicate classroom instruction, but to heighten awareness of the nature of the curriculum tasks assigned the child. With this awareness, the specialist teacher can begin to consider how to link the instruction offered down the hall with that of the classroom.

Many at-risk children need increased opportunities to actually read and write — opportunities to apply the skills and strategies that were the focus of classroom instruction. These children are the ones that seem least likely to transfer skills and strategies from isolated drill and practice activities to real reading and writing situations. Too often they have limited opportunities to actually read and write in the classroom reading/language arts period (they spend more time on skill work). At other times, they need personal review of a strategy lesson to clarify some aspect that was unclear after classroom coverage. In either case, the specialist teacher cannot provide such instructional opportunities while remaining unaware of the classroom curriculum, lessons, and performance.

A workable plan

Attempting too much in too short a time leads to frustration. Thus, we have developed a strategy that begins movement in the directions sketched above. This strategy can be applied by either classroom or specialist teachers (although the example below is for the latter).

Year 1

Find one classroom teacher to collaborate with in planning and delivering instructional support. Begin with an interested colleague, and work on your collaboration skills. Spend the year familiarizing yourself with the regular education curriculum, particularly the one for that classroom and grade level. Suggest observing children you serve in the regular classroom and suggest that the classroom teacher observe you (ideally while you work with the child from her room). Review the current IEP with the classroom teacher with an eye toward integrating classroom curriculum into your plans. Plan to meet for 5 minutes twice a week with the classroom teacher (Monday and Friday) to establish and review a plan for the week.

Year 2

Add two more teachers, one at the same grade level as the teacher from year 1 and one at a different grade level. Continue working with the original collaborator, although you should expect that it will take less time this year. The other teacher at the same grade level presents fewer problems because you already have a handle on the classroom curriculum for that grade. For the teacher at the new grade level, you will have to study that curriculum and learn the classroom demands for that grade level. Many specialist teachers add another teacher or two later in the year, usually at the same grade levels as the others they work with.

Year 3

Add another grade level in the Fall and another in the Spring, but just one teacher for each. As you become more familiar with the regular education curriculum plan and materials, it will take substantially less time to develop a strong working familiarity with that curriculum on other grade levels. As you become more skilled at collaboration, it will also take less time to cooperatively plan instruction. Near the end of this year invite all the other classroom teachers with whose children you work to collaborate. If more than half are willing, consider your efforts a success.

Conclusion

Collaboration leads to coordination of instruction, which results in coherent curriculum experiences. Children who find learning to read difficult need more and better instruction than others, and they benefit from instruction that follows a coherent curriculum. In order to fulfill the potential of remedial and special education we must redesign the traditions that emerged in both cases — traditions that fostered the curriculum fragmentation observed today. We must have the right and left hands working together so that the Michaels of this world can fulfill their potential.

Dr. Allington earned his Ph.D. in Elementary and Special Education at Michigan State University, and is Professor of Education and Chair, Department of Reading, SUNY at Albany. He recently conducted a federally funded study of literacy instruction offered to learning disabled students with an emphasis on coordination of instruction in mainstream and resource classrooms.

[Editor's Note: Provided on page 3 is a sample format for one week of coordinated lessons between classroom and remedial instruction, developed by PRISE. The activities include a variety of possible techniques and are only a few examples of ones that can be used for any given week. Specifics will vary with student skill levels, scheduling considerations, and nature of passages to be taught (e.g., narrative vs. expository text). Each activity may require more classroom time than has been allocated, depending upon conditions in that classroom, and any given classroom might require fewer activities.

We encourage teachers to share completed planning sheets for various basal reading levels, to help vary the types of activities used in their classrooms.]

SAMPLE CURRICULAR COORDINATION PLANNING SHEET*

Student Name: Michael **Classroom Teacher:** Ms. Jones **Specialist Teacher:** Ms. Smith

Grade: 4 **Lesson:** Wolves, pp. 35-38

	Classroom Program	Special Program
Friday Nov. 3	Finish lesson on previous unit	**Background knowledge:**[1] pre-reading mapping activity, e.g., teacher identifies categories such as wolf habitats, physical characteristics, food; in group activity, students identify category elements **Vocabulary**: from previous activity, students predict key words to be found in passage; teacher adds other words not on classroom teacher's list[2]
Monday Nov. 6	**Background knowledge:** brainstorming re students' knowledge of wolves **Vocabulary:** teacher introduces new words Students silently **read** first section of story; read same section orally in round robin format Oral **comprehension** questions after each page **Seatwork:** answer workbook questions	Review **advance organizers** in passage, e.g., headings, italics, captions, to predict what passage will be about Teacher asks inferential **comprehension** questions not provided in basal, i.e., questions that require students to put together ideas, not just recall facts **Writing:** pre-writing skill activity on outlining; teacher develops outline for essay she will write on wolves; verbalizes thinking behind each step as a means of modeling the process of outlining
Tuesday Nov. 7	**Vocabulary:** locate new words in dictionary; write sentences using each word **Read** next section silently, then orally answer questions **Seatwork**: complete workbook comprehension questions	**Comprehension:** after reading passage in classroom, students check pre-reading map for accuracy as group activity **Writing:** students develop outlines for essays they will write on wolves
Wednesday Nov. 8	**Mini-lesson** on plurals **Reinforcement** worksheet on plurals completed in large group **Writing:** students individually write/illustrate a paragraph on wolves	**Comprehension:** teacher provides three versions of retellings of passage on wolves; in pairs, students select and justify best version **Writing:** students draft individual essays on wolves; teacher models process by writing own essay
Thursday Nov. 9	**Vocabulary:** test Begin new lesson on *bald eagles*; repeat format as in Monday	**Writing:** teacher guides peer editing **Mini-lesson** on compare/contrast structure; students develop pre-reading semantic map for *bald eagles* using categories from Friday[3]

* Adapted by PRISE from a form developed by Mary C. Shake, University of Kentucky, Lexington

[1] The specialist teacher (e.g., Chapter I or special education teacher) should obtain a copy of the passage and key vocabulary words from the classroom teacher a day or two in advance.

[2] The specialist teacher shares with the classroom teacher the vocabulary list that she and the students have generated.

[3] Subsequent remedial class lessons could include a discussion of the structure of expository passages, the development of a comparison/contrast map as a pre-writing activity, and a mini-lesson on transitional phrases (e.g., "on the one hand," "similarly," "in contrast").

CURRENT CITATIONS

Allington, R. L., & Johnston, P. (1989). **Coordination, collaboration, and consistency: The redesign of compensatory and special education interventions.** In R. E. Slavin, N. L. Karweit, N. A. Madden (Eds.), *Effective programs for students at risk* (pp. 320-354). Allyn and Bacon, 200 Old Tappan Road, Old Tappan, NJ 07685, 800/223-1360. $32.95

Evidence suggests that many at-risk learners do not have access to instructional settings offering high-quality instruction within a consistent curriculum. Rather, those who need the most carefully organized instruction receive an incoherent mixture of curricular approaches.

This chapter focuses on the importance of coordinating extra-instructional support programs for at-risk learners. This coordination involves collaboration between regular education and instructional support personnel, a crucial step toward curricular consistency. While such combined efforts are not easily achieved, suggestions for encouraging curricular coordination are offered: (1) cooperatively develop curricula with explicit rationales, (2) capitalize on teacher training and teacher inservice development, (3) allocate sufficient time for regular conferencing between teachers, (4) observe at-risk student performance in various instructional settings, and (5) maintain continuous process records of childrens' development.

Walp, T. P., & Walmsley, S. A. (1989). **Instructional and philosophical congruence: Neglected aspects of coordination.** *Reading Teacher, 42* (5), 364-368.

Efforts to make remedial and regular education more congruent by legislators, federal and state education agencies and educators usually stop at procedural congruence (e.g., reports by Chapter I personnel of routines used for coordination with regular classroom teachers), when the problem is considered solved. But procedural congruence may be viewed as a first step toward

instructional congruence (the ways in which content and delivery of instruction are related between remedial and regular programs) and philosophical congruence (the underlying assumptions in both settings).

A number of issues are posed for discussion by regular and compensatory teachers concerning congruence in instruction—e.g., timing and presentation of classroom material (before or after introduction in the regular classroom), use of same or different materials in both settings, and congruence in philosophy (e.g., relative emphasis on decoding vs. comprehension). Remedial and classroom teachers are urged to use mutual planning time to discuss such issues, beginning with sharing knowledge and moving to an examination of research about the practices in both settings.

Dole, J. A., & Osborn, J. (1989). **Reading materials: Their selection and use** (Technical Report No. 427). Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 51 Gentry Drive, Champaign, IL 61820. 16 pp. $3.00

This paper provides administrators and supervisors of reading programs with information to help them evaluate and select commercially-developed reading materials. Part I describes problems observed by researchers studying the adoption of basal reading programs and provides suggestions for the improvement of the adoption process, based on research and experience. The importance of using other reading materials is also discussed. Part I concludes with a review of materials used to teach reading in many middle and high schools. Part II contains an overview of research on how teachers use reading materials in their classroom and concludes with a section stressing the importance of teacher decision making and staff development to better understand the use of new and other materials. The paper concludes with a set of guidelines for the selection and use of materials.

Goodman, K. S., Shannon, P., Freeman, Y. & Murphy, S. (1988). **Report card on basal readers.** Richard C. Owen, Publishers, 135 Katonah Avenue, Katonah, N. Y. 10536. 167 pp. $7.50.

This report, initiated by the Commission on Reading of the National Council of Teachers of English, examines the nature, history, economics, and use of modern basal reading programs. Discussed is the central premise of basal reading materials—that a sequential all-inclusive set of instructional materials can teach children to read, regardless of teacher competence and learner differences. Considered are the opinions of reading experts, teachers and researchers concerning basal readers, as well as the influence of state intervention, district administrative policy, and publishers' marketing strategies. Issues discussed involve the making and marketing of basals, including the initial plan to produce a new series; roles of the publishers, authors and editors; the finalizing of the plan; selection of content; art and physical aspects; and cost factors.

The report criticizes reliance on the viewpoint of reading instruction that breaks down reading into sequenceable components that can be controlled and explicitly taught. Reviewed are the use of controlled vocabulary, scope and sequence, along with the fracturing and narrowing of language, with an emphasis on word focus, controlled learning and teaching, and reliance on basal tests.

The final section covers alternatives to traditional use of basals. Teachers can choose not to use them, schools can purchase children's literature in their place, staff development and administrative support can be provided to develop alternatives, and school and district policies can be refocused. Reading instruction in Canada, New Zealand, England and Australia are discussed, as well as supplementary American programs as alternatives. Twenty-eight recommendations for change are listed for teachers, administrators, teacher educators, professional associations, researchers, authors, editors, publishers, and policy makers. Finally, seven recommendations for immediate implementation are listed.

See also the Commission on Reading's Position Statement **Report on Basal Readers**; one copy free on request with an enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope from the National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, IL 61801.

Shannon, P., & Goodman, K. S. (Eds.). 1989. **Perspectives on basal readers** [Entire issue]. *Theory Into Practice*, *28*(4), 234-306.

This collection of articles includes both the perspective that basal readers are a necessary part of reading instruction and that basals are an obstacle to learning to read because of an emphasis on isolated skills, rather than real applications of reading and writing. Written from the perspectives of researchers, teachers, publishers, students, and theoreticians, these articles address such issues as state level adoption of basal readers, children's understandings of basal readers, basal-free classrooms, and political and economic influences on textbook publishing.

Tyson-Bernstein, H. (1988). **A conspiracy of good intentions: America's textbook fiasco.** Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education, 725 15th St.-NW, Washington, DC 20005, 202/347-4171. 113pp. $10.00 plus $3.00 postage/handling.

This text provides an analysis of the political process by which textbooks are written, published, adopted, and bought. Those responsible for making adoption decisions often determine only the presence of the large amounts of material required by some states, not the depth or clarity of that material. Texts are viewed as collections of isolated names, dates, charts, and terms, often with choppy, stilted, monotonous writing and no theme. Recommendations are provided for national academic organizations, teacher unions, publishers, and policymakers in both adoption and non-adoption states, to encourage use of texts that teach skills closely related to the content of stories, that use topics and facts to support an overall theme, and contain questions and exercises that encourage students to think rather than locate trivial details. Also provided are a fictionalized account of the process of publication and adoption and a model of a successful program. Note: An executive summary of this book is available in the periodical *Basic Education*, *32* (8), 1-14.

Winograd, P. N., Wixson, K. K., & Lipson, N. Y. (Eds.). (1989). **Improving basal reading instruction.** Teachers College Press, P.O. Box 939, Wolfeboro, NH 03894, 800/356-0409. 320 pp. $19.95 paper, $39.95 cloth.

Intended for use with inservice teacher programs and as a supplementary text in undergraduate and graduate level courses in reading methods, this text reviews 10 to 15 years of research on basal reading instruction. Containing essays by 10 well-known researchers in reading instruction, it provides teachers with guidelines for integrating basals into a balanced and effective program. Part I focuses on teaching the basal reader

selection, grouping and pacing, and integrating seatwork activities with the basal lesson. Part II considers evaluating students and individualizing instruction within a basal program. Part III examines ways to integrate and expand basal instruction in beginning reading, children's literature, writing, and content-area reading. A summary includes a set of procedures for use in reducing the array of basal programs for review to a manageable number.

RESEARCH BRIEFS

Allington, R. L., McGill-Franzen, A. (1989). **School response to reading failure: Instruction for Chapter I and special education students in grades two, four and eight.** *The Elementary School Journal, 89* (5), 529-542.

When 64 students in grades 2, 4 and 8 were observed, students identified as disadvantaged participating in Chapter I were found to receive significantly more reading/language arts instruction in their regular education classes than mainstreamed children identified as handicapped served through special education programs. The latter received more special reading instruction than did Chapter I students, but the amount was not sufficient to offset the loss in the regular education program. Instruction offered in the special education program provided less direct teaching and more seatwork than instruction in either the regular education or the Chapter I program. These results suggest that the special education programs studied did not generally improve either the quantity or quality of reading/language arts instruction received by the participants. The small amounts of reading/language arts instruction offered mainstreamed handicapped students also must be of concern.

Miller, C. D., Miller, L. F., & Rosen, L. A. (1988). **Modified reciprocal teaching in a regular classroom.** *Journal of Experimental Education, 56* (4), 183-186.

This study used modified reciprocal teaching to increase reading comprehension and academic achievement in seventh grade regular education social studies classes. Modified reciprocal teaching involved small groups of students working together to read and comprehend a portion of text. Students took turns "teaching" by assisting the rest of the group in selecting key words and phrases, summarizing, questioning, clarifying, and predicting. One class used modified reciprocal teaching twice a week for eight weeks while two classes received traditional instruction by the same teacher. Those participating in modified reciprocal teaching groups scored higher on comprehension tests and writing samples, showed grade improvement, and had better conduct records than the control groups.

Several hypotheses explain the superior performance of the students participating in modified reciprocal teaching. Reading was goal-directed and student involvement both in the group effort and as "teacher" of the group were highly motivating. Paraphrasing enabled students to encode material in a manner consistent with individual learning style, and clarification of material was immediate.

ASSESSMENT

Good, R. H., & Salvia, J. (1988). **Curriculum bias in published, norm-referenced reading tests: Demonstrable effects.** *School Psychology Review, 17* (1), 51-60.

Content validity of four reading achievement tests (the Peabody Individual Achievement Test, the Wide Range Achievement Test, the California Achievement Test and the Metropolitan Achievement Test) was evaluated for two grade levels of the Pathfinder Allyn and Bacon Reading Program. Estimates of reading achievement were obtained on the four tests for 65 students. Content validity standard scores were used to quantify the match between each test and the curriculum.

The study demonstrated significant differences in test performance for the same students on different reading tests which could be predicted by each test's content validity. The implication that students in one curriculum may score differently on various reading achievement tests as a function of the test's content validity was supported. Thus, the reading measures displayed significant curriculum bias that affected pupil scores. Curriculum bias may represent a substantial factor in decisions regarding referral, diagnosis, placement, and instruction.

RESOURCES

Information Center for Special Education Media and Materials. (1990). **Database report: Instructional materials and resources that incorporate learning strategies to teach reading.** LINC Resources, Inc., 4820 Indianola Avenue, Columbus, OH 43214, 800/772-7372, 614/885-5599. 28 pp. $5.00

This listing is a selective compilation of commercially available instructional and professional materials that incorporate or support the use of research-based instructional methods. Each of the 23 product listings includes the following entries: title, author, format, cost, reading level, grade, interest level, description, approach, information on effectiveness, and publisher name and address. Both basal readers and supplementary materials are included.

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL

Reading and Thinking Strategies, Grades 7 - 8, consists of eight modules arranged in developmental sequence. The first, an introduction to strategic reading, familiarizes users with the group discussion format and whole-class instruction. Modules 2 -8 contain three lessons about particular aspects of reading tasks or thinking strategies, followed by several informal assessments of students' learning and strategic reading. The first lesson introduces the strategy and includes teacher modeling and explanation. In the second lesson, students generate the strategy and apply it; the third lesson allows teachers to select reading material from their students' regular content area texts and apply the strategies.

The thinking strategies include making inferences; strategies used before, during, and after reading; aesthetic aspects of reading; identifying text structure; connecting events in temporal and causal sequences; comprehension monitoring; underlining and outlining key information; rules for summarizing; study strategies and review; and evaluation. Each module introduces material using a metaphor that is a concrete representation of a thinking strategy or cognitive characteristic of reading. Teacher-led discussion of the strategy follows, including how it operates, why it is effective, and when the student should apply the strategy. Reading, writing, and thinking strategies are used to

reinforce the teacher-led discussion. Finally, students are provided feedback on their use of the strategy. All lessons, which include direct explanation of the strategy and workbook exercises, are designed to be completed in 45 minutes.

Paris, S. G. (1989). **Reading and Thinking Strategies, Grades 7-8**, D. C. Heath, 2700 North Richardt Avenue, P. O. Box 19309, Indianapolis, IN 46219, 800/428-8071. $161.95

SOFTWARE

Explore-a-Story is a series of twelve integrated storybook-based programs that helps students in grades K-5 develop reading, writing and creative thinking skills. Each title moves the user from reading or hearing the story to paging through the same scenes on the computer screen with the option of changing or experimenting with the characters, scenery, and text. Students can control this pointer with a "mouse," joystick, Touch Screen, or keyboard. A "menu-bar" permits the selection of additional characters, scenery, backgrounds, or objects and lets them be placed anywhere on the computer screen. Original story text or prepared labels for objects can also be added to each page. This allows the user to recreate what was read, to create sequels or entirely new versions of the story. Student work can be saved on a data disk and/or printed in color or in black and white. Individual or cooperatively created books can be assembled from a series of these pictures.

In addition to the program disk, a student disk includes story-starter, vocabulary, comprehension, and other activities related to the original story. The stories are often infused with humor or incidents to stimulate creative writing. Most activities lend themselves to either small group or individual use.

Each of the twelve titles includes a program disk, student disk, back-up disks, five softcover story books and a teacher's guide. Student Activity Books and additional sets of storybooks are available. An Apple IIe (with 128K of memory,) IIc or IIgs is required, and a color monitor and a printer are highly recommended.

Explore-A-Story Series. Collamore Educational Publishing, D. C. Heath & Company, 2700 North Richardt Avenue, P.O.Box 19309, Indianapolis, IN 46219. 800/428-8071. 1987, 1988. $75.00 per title.

Editor's Note: The insert in the previous issue on homeless children, a chart titled "Conditions Experienced by Homeless Children and Related Intervention Strategies," was developed by Michelle F. Linehan of the Massachusetts Department of Education.

PRISE reporter is published by the Eastern Instructional Support Center of Pennsylvania (E-ISC), Marianne Price, Director. Funded by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education, through P.L. 94-142. E-ISC is administered, managed, and supervised by Montgomery County Intermediate Unit #23, Erdenheim, Pennsylvania, Dennis Harken, Executive Director.

PRISE is a service of E-ISC, a component of the Instructional Support System of Pennsylvania (ISSP). Overall administration of ISSP is conducted by Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit #16, Patrick F. Toole, Executive Director. MCIU #23, an equal opportunity educational service agency, does not discriminate on the basis of sex, handicap, race, color, national origin, age or religion in its education program and activities or employment, as required by Title IX, Title VI, and Section 504. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of PDE, the U.S. Department of Education, MCIU #23, or CSIU #16, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

Department of Education — Donald M. Carroll, Jr. Secretary

Robert P. Casey, Governor

Bureau of Special Education — James A. Tucker Director

PRISE reporter

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 6
Gibsonia, Pa.

Mailed locally through:

REACH
Western Pennsylvania Special Education
Regional Resources Center
5347 William Flynn Highway, Rt. 8
Gibsonia, Pennsylvania 15044

ADDRESS CHANGE REQUESTED